

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
APPLICATION NO. 09/197,643  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q52377

### REMARKS

#### General remarks.

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, applicant rewrites claims 9-11 in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant also amends claims 1 and 12-14. In particular, each of these claims has been amended so as to clarify that the image data output from the input device is such that each dot has a combination type of data of all the color elements. This requirement is not new matter, and is supported in the originally-filed specification at least at page 19, lines 8-10, and also Fig. 3 (see the RGB multilevel data stored in the image memory 12e).

#### Claim Rejection under 102(b).

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maenaka et al. (US 5,552,827) (hereinafter "Maenaka"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection in view of the comments which follow.

#### *Claims 1-10*

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, first with respect to claims 1-10. Of these claims, only claim 1 is independent. Claim 1, as now amended, requires that the image data be such that each dot has a combination of data from all the color elements. Maenaka does not provide such a system, because in Maenaka the image data is such that each dot has only one of the element colors.

It is respectfully submitted that this difference patentably distinguishes claim 1 over Maenaka. The Maenaka process cannot handle color data where each dot has a combination of data from all the color elements, is not applicable to processing such data, and cannot be used to reduce color blur where each dot contains all-color element data. Inasmuch as Maenaka lacks

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
APPLICATION NO. 09/197,643  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q52377

any teaching or suggestion of a system that would meet the requirements of claim 1, as now amended, Applicant respectfully submits that Maenaka cannot be said to anticipate or even render obvious the subject matter of independent claim 1 or any of its dependent claims 2-6. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of independent claim 1, and also its rejected dependent claims.

In view of the substantial similarities between the amendments to claim 1 and the amendments to claims 12-14, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing comments apply with equal force to these claims. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection also with respect to independent claims 12-14.

Claim Rejection under 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maenaka in view of Takizawa et al. (US 6,388,706B1) (hereinafter "Takizawa"), and claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maenaka in view of Kido et al. (US 5,561,724) (hereinafter "Kido"). It has already been demonstrated that Maenaka does not meet all the requirements of independent claims 1 and 12-14, as now amended.

Takizawa does not compensate for these deficiencies of Maenaka, and, even taken together as a whole, the combined teachings of Maenaka and Takizawa would not have enabled an artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of any of these independent claims. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 7 and 8.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 9-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has so rewritten these claims, and respectfully requests of the Examiner their allowance.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
APPLICATION NO. 09/197,643  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q52377


Conclusion and request for telephone interview.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

  
Kelly G. Hyndman  
Registration No. 39,234

Date: July 11, 2003